

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully traverses and requests reconsideration.

Claims 1-3 and 6-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Swanstrom, et al.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant respectfully requests that all of their remarks be addressed in a non-final action if the claims are not passed to allowance since it does not appear that the “Response to Arguments” section addresses Applicant’s remarks with respect to at least claims 6 and 8-11 (see page 11 of previous response).

As to claim 1, it appears that claim language is being overlooked and that different elements from different embodiments appear to be combined in the rejection in an attempt to render the claim obvious. For example, the office action alleges that arbiter 504 FIG. 7 (or 614 of FIG. 10) correspond to the claimed bus arbiter. It is noted that FIGs. 7 and 10 refer to a different embodiment from other embodiments described in the reference and in particular, the arbiters 504 and 614 are connected with a “control channel”. The control channel as described in Swanstrom is used so that the PCI bus 120 (alleged to correspond to the claimed system bus) is not used. As stated in column 14:

When the multimedia devices 142A-146A communicate using the real-time bus 130, the devices use the control channel 502 for addressing, control, status and handshaking signals. Thus the devices 142A-146A do not utilize any PCI bus cycles when communicating over the multimedia bus 130. (column 14, lines 29-34). (Emphasis added).

As such, the alleged system bus in Swanstrom is not used when the arbiter 504 is used. The arbiter 504 is connected to the control channel for addressing signals, control and status signals. Applicant respectfully submits that the arbiter 504 of FIG. 7 and the configuration shown in FIG. 7 or FIG. 10 as indicated above notes that the alleged system bus is not used

during the arbitration operation. As further described in column 13, FIG. 7 shows a dedicated control channel 502 that is separate from the PCI bus 120 and the multimedia bus 130 for transferring control information for the multimedia bus data transfers. The multimedia data transfer initially involves the transfer of control information on the dedicated control channel 502 which includes the arbiter 504, followed by the transfer of data streams preferably periodic data streams on the multimedia bus 130. When employing the arbiter 504 and separate control bus 502 and using the real time bus 130, the system bus 120 is not utilized.

This is different from the claimed circuit. The claimed bus arbiter, alleged to be arbiter 504 for example, “interprets the incoming data” from the system bus and provides the incoming data from the system bus to the audio processing circuit or the video graphics processing circuit. Such a bus arbiter is not described in the cited portions because the bus arbiter 504 does not interpret incoming data on the system bus – alleged to be bus 120 – since bus 120 as described in column 14 is not utilized. As such, Applicant respectfully submits that the reference does not teach the claimed subject matter.

In addition, Applicant notes that the claim is directed to a circuit that includes both a graphics processing circuit, an audio processing circuit and bus arbiter as claimed. The Swanstrom reference does not claim such circuits coupled to an arbiter but instead describes whole “devices” being connected through a dedicated multimedia bus. Applicant also noted this in the previous response but it was not addressed. If the rejection is maintained, Applicant respectfully requests a showing as to where the cited reference teaches the claimed subject matter.

As to claim 2, the claim requires that the bus arbiter routes received data to the graphics processing circuitry when the address is received via the local bus to route received data to the

audio processing circuit when the address identifies the audio processing circuit. Applicant respectfully submits that the arbiter of Swanstrom does not route data but instead merely allows one “device” to be accessing the dedicated bus at a time. The “Response to Arguments” section attempts to address this apparently by referring to FIG. 3A of Swanstrom, column 9, lines 35-59. However, the cited portion does not refer to the operation that employs the arbiter of FIG. 7. To the contrary, it refers to the embodiment where no arbiter 504 is being employed. Moreover, the cited portion in addition to not referring to the bus arbiter as required by the claim, also merely indicates that an address indicating a destination address is transferred along with control information to another device. This operation is not being claimed by Applicant. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 2 is also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 6, Applicant respectfully reasserts the remarks made in the previous response and notes that since Applicant’s remarks were not addressed, the claims are in condition for allowance. If the claims are not passed to allowance, Applicant respectfully requests a new final action or non-final action that addresses Applicant’s previous remarks in the previous response since it is improper to provide an Advisory Action which for the first time addresses Applicant’s remarks made after the first office action.

Claims 4 and 5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Swanstrom et al. in view of Post. Applicant respectfully reasserts the relevant remarks made above and as such these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Swanstrom. This is an anticipation rejection. However, the final action states that “it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art” to integrate all the components into a single chip. Applicant

respectfully submits that the rejection is an improper anticipation rejection and therefore the claim is in condition for allowance.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully challenges the conclusion since Swanstrom specifically teaches “separate devices” which is a similar type of prior art system noted in Applicant’s Background of the Invention section. Such systems require multiple video graphic circuit boards or audio processing circuit boards and do not utilize or require the claimed structure. In addition, Applicant respectfully notes that claim 24 is also at least allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. As noted above, no bus arbiter is claimed in combination with the circuits that are provided in the cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 6, 2007

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp/

Christopher J. Reckamp
Registration No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005